

25X1A

Approved For Release 2001/08/02 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000700150037-3

Approved For Release 2001/08/02 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000700150037-3

25X1A

(1) Para. a(4)(a).

The proposal by the Administrative Authorities Committee on which the changes in this paragraph are based was as follows: "Limit payment of travel and transportation expenses of an employee retiring abroad to a place in the United States, its territories or possessions, designated by the employee at the time of retirement." The principal reason given was "to limit the current preferential right of those retiring abroad to receive payment of travel and transportation expenses to any place in the world." The discussion included the following statement: "We believe that the number of personnel staying overseas should be kept to a minimum for security reasons, and the Agency should not as a matter of policy condone or encourage them to remain abroad by paying their travel costs to an overseas destination." (The discussion could also have noted that by encouraging residence abroad the Agency would be contributing to the imbalance of payments.) We agree with the above purpose. We are not sure it will be achieved by the second sentence of the paragraph as written. "Permanent place of residence" will be, we understand, usually the place where the employee was actually residing before his departure for overseas, but the

employee may, before his departure, on acceptable justification approved by the Director of Personnel, designate some other location as his permanent place of residence. This designated place would then be the basis for the constructive cost computation against which travel and transportation to a place of retirement abroad would be paid. Our preference, in descending order, in a case where a retiring employee elects to reside abroad, is:

- (a) Pay no travel or transportation costs on the basis that the Agency stands ready to return the employee, his dependents and effects to the place where he will reside in the United States, but, if he elects not to return, the Agency has no further obligation.
- (b) Pay costs up to the constructive cost of travel and transportation to the closest port of entry in CONUS.
- (c) Pay costs up to the constructive cost of travel and transportation to headquarters or other U.S. location from which the employee was transferred to his overseas post.

(2) Para. a(4)(b).

We have reservations similar to those noted above regarding the second sentence of this paragraph. The sentence as

written would permit an employee who is retiring in the United States but elects to reside abroad to be reimbursed for travel and transportation costs up to the constructive cost of travel and transportation from his last post of assignment to his place of permanent residence. If an employee retires while assigned to headquarters and his permanent place of residence is also in the headquarters area, he would of course have no travel and transportation entitlement; but an employee who was planning on retiring and residing abroad might well have arranged some time before to have his permanent place of residence changed. We are not at all sure the Agency should pay any travel and transportation costs for a retiring employee who elects to reside abroad. If it pays any costs, we suggest these be up to the constructive cost of travel and transportation from the last post of assignment to the employee's permanent place of residence, or from the last post of assignment to the nearest port of exit, whichever is less.

(3) Para. a(6)(b).

25X1A6a

25X1A

b

Substitution of "should" for "shall" in paragraph e. may be interpreted as a relaxation of the stated requirement. We believe "shall" should be retained.

c

We are uncertain what entitlement there would be for shipment of a vehicle in a case where an employee retires in the United States but elects to reside in a foreign country. In our opinion, the Agency should not pay any cost for shipping a vehicle in such a case, or, if any, should certainly not pay the total cost. A retiree who will reside in CONUS is not entitled to shipment of a vehicle. We see no justification for paying, in the case of a retiree who is going to a foreign country to reside, a cost to which a retiree who will reside in CONUS is not entitled.

We disagree with deletion of the words "if appointee travel under subparagraph 2a(1) above was authorized." We presume that these words were included in the present regulation in recognition of the fact that, in the case of a person who resigns or is separated while assigned abroad, the Agency has an obligation to transport him only to headquarters from which he was transferred overseas, unless at the time of his appointment it undertook

an obligation to return him to the place where he was then residing. Perhaps the words should be modified, however, since travel to the place of residence at time of appointment could be in order, not only when the place from which appointed is in a foreign country (to which subparagraph 2a(1) refers), but also when such place is in the United States.